

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

With the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 being in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 6 have been amended. No new matter has been added to the application.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zhang* (US 6,016,478), in view of *Hotaling* (US 5,124,912) and further in view of *Dedrick* (US 5,724,521). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that the rejected claims are allowable over the art of record.

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicants submit that *Zhang*, *Hotaling* and *Dedrick*, considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1. For example, at the least, *Zhang*, *Hotaling* and *Dedrick*, considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a

“A system for scheduling time intervals for a plurality of invitees in a networked environment comprising: graphical user interface means associated with the request generating means for displaying results from the busy time determination means, the graphical user interface means permitting a user to select from at least three results viewing options including a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are available, a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found,”

Amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Referring first to *Zhang*, *Zhang* teaches an electronic group scheduling system. However, as the Examiner correctly pointed out in the July 27, 2000 Office Action (Paper No. 7), *Zhang* does not teach or suggest a graphical user interface that provides “at least three viewing options including a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that

are available, a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found,” as is recited in claim 1.

Referring next to *Hotaling*, *Hotaling*, like *Zhang*, does not teach or suggest the above mentioned feature of claim 1. *Hotaling* teaches a meeting management system that determines an optimal meeting date and time for a specified group of invitees within a set of specified time parameters. *Hotaling* further discloses a “Summary Results” screen (see FIG. 10 of *Hotaling*).

The summary results screen “displays the top five counting time slots of the solution table as the five most acceptable solutions.” *Hotaling*, Col. 9, lines 35-37. The summary results screen permits the user to select only a single viewing option, which is called the “Detail Results” viewing option. See Column 9, lines 46-50 (“The user can review details of any entry in the list displayed on the Summary Results screen by positioning the cursor next to the entry and pressing the Return key to arrive at a Detail Results Screen ...”). The Detail Results viewing option, which is the only viewing option available, displays all of the invitees and each invitee’s corresponding availability status.

In contrast, the invention according to claim 1, permits the user to select more than just a single viewing option; it permits the user to select any one of three or more viewing options. One viewing option that the user may select displays the invitees that are available, but does not display the invitees that are unavailable. Another viewing option that the user may select displays the invitees that are unavailable, but not those that are available. And a third viewing option that the user may select displays the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found.

Consequently, *Hotaling* does not teach or suggest “permitting the user to select from at least three results viewing options,” as is recited in claim 1. Moreover, a single viewing option is not equivalent to multiple viewing options. Multiple viewing options provide the user with greater flexibility than a single viewing option.

With respect to *Dedrick*, *Dedrick* also does not teach or suggest “permitting the user to select from at least three results viewing options,” as is recited in claim 1.

In short, neither *Zhang*, *Hotaling*, nor *Dedrick*, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 3, the above remarks for claim 1 apply, because claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1.

With respect to independent claims 4-6, the above remarks for claim 1 apply because, like claim 1, claims 4-6 include the feature of “permitting the user to select from at least three results viewing options.”

With respect to dependent claims 7-20, the above remarks apply because these claims depend from one of claims 1, 4, 5 and 6.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current Amendment. The attached page is captioned “**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made.**”

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO PC



Brian S. Rosenbloom
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,276

Date: June 18, 2001
11911 Freedom Drive, Suite 400
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 464-4810

Version with markings to show changes made

1. (Third Amendment) A system for scheduling time intervals for a plurality of invitees in a networked environment comprising:

database means for storing one or more invitee profiles for one or more potential invitees of the system, the one or more invitee profiles comprising user profiles wherein each user profile comprises information regarding available and unavailable times for that user, the database means being located at one or more server locations;

request generating means, located remotely from the server locations, for generating a request for allocation of a time interval for the one or more potential invitees;

busy time determination means for gathering the invitee profiles for the one or more potential invitees and determining whether each of the one or more potential invitees is available during the time interval requested by the request generating means; and

graphical user interface means associated with the request generating means for displaying results from the busy time determination means, the graphical user interface means permitting a user to select from at least three results viewing options including a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are available, a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found, and then displaying the results according to the viewing option selected[;

wherein the graphical user interface means displays the results which are based in part on a weighting function of a best fit algorithm used by the busy time determination means].

4. (Third Amendment) A system for scheduling time intervals for a plurality of invitees comprising:

one or more databases which store one or more invitee profiles for one or more potential invitees of the system, the one or more invitee profiles comprising user profiles, wherein each user profile comprises information regarding available and unavailable times for that user, the databases being located at one or more servers;

one or more user client systems connected over a network to the one or more servers operating a calendaring system which enables a user to request allocation of a time interval for one or more potential invitees;

wherein the calendaring system gathers the one or more invitee profiles for each of the one or more potential invitees and determines whether each of the one or more potential invitees is available during the requested time interval; and

wherein the calendaring system permits the user to select from at least three results viewing options including a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are available, a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found, and then displays the results according to the viewing option selected[;

wherein the results displayed are based in part on a weighting function of a best fit algorithm used by the calendaring system].

5. (Third Amendment) A process for scheduling time intervals for a plurality of invitees comprising:

storing one or more invitee profiles for one or more potential invitees of the system, the one or more invitee profiles comprising user profiles wherein each user profile comprises information regarding available and unavailable times for that user;

receiving a request for allocation of a time interval for the one or more potential invitees;

gathering the invitee profiles for the one or more potential invitees;

determining whether the potential invitees are available during the requested time interval; and

displaying results by permitting a user to select from at least three results viewing options including a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are available, a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying the one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found, and then displaying the results according to the option selected[;

wherein the step of displaying displays the results which are based in part on a weighting function of a best fit algorithm used in the step of determining].

6. (Third Amendment) A processor usable medium having processor readable code embodied therein for enabling group calendaring between a plurality of users on a system, the system comprising one or more databases, associated with one or more servers, which stores one or more invitee profiles for one or more potential invitees of the system, the one or more invitee profiles comprising user profiles, wherein each user profile comprises information regarding available and unavailable times for that user, the processor readable code in the processor usable medium comprising:

processor readable code for causing a processor to receive a request for allocation of a time interval for the one or more potential invitees;

processor readable code for causing a processor to gather the one or more invitee profiles for the one or more potential invitees;

processor readable code for causing a processor to determine whether the one or more potential invitees are available during the requested time interval; and

processor readable code for causing a processor to display results by permitting a user to select from at least three results viewing options including a viewing option displaying those one or more potential invitees that are available, a viewing option displaying those one or more potential invitees that are not available and a viewing option displaying those one or more potential invitees whose schedule could not be found, and then displaying the results according to the viewing option selected[;

wherein the results displayed are based in part on a weighting function of a best fit algorithm].